

3/15/19
3/15/19
FILED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

MAR 14 2019 ★

BROOKLYN OFFICE

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

X

JAN WELENC

Plaintiff,

-against-

PSFCU DIRECTORS

Matyrszyk et al
Defendants.

AMENDED
COMPLAINT

18 cv 6087 (PKO)(RLM)

In my complaint to the Court, I put the address of PSFCU New York office of the defendant Directors, which was the nearest to my place of residence. However, PSFCU has two branches in New York and New Jersey in which defendants have also their offices. In Fairfield (NJ) there is a modern PSFCU Operating Center, where directors handle the most important financial matters. High Court, when making decision to dismiss Plaintiff's case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and diversity jurisdiction, did not take into account this fact. Because the defendants have their offices in two different states of NY and NJ, this fact undermines Court's argument about lack of diversity jurisdiction. Therefore, I think that there is a basis for reconsideration of my case by the Court of Appeals.

By the way, I would like to refer to the precedent of the case of Mielczarek v. PSFCU (Case # 2: 12-cv-05162). As a result of the judgment of the US District Court of New Jersey Dir. Mielczarek as a result of the settlement received a large compensation.

Jan Welenc

